BUDGET RESOLUTION/Elderly Housing

SUBJECT: Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1999-2003 . . . S.Con. Res. 86. Bond/Mikulski amendment No. 2213.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 97-2

SYNOPSIS: As reported, S.Con. Res. 86, the Senate Concurrent Budget Resolution for fiscal years 1999-2003, will balance the unified budget in 1998 and will run surpluses for each of the next 5 fiscal years. Both Federal spending and Federal revenues will increase 3.5 percent from fiscal year (FY) 1998 to FY 1999. All surpluses will be reserved for Social Security reform. A reserve fund will be established to allow the entire Federal share of revenues resulting from a potential tobacco settlement to be dedicated to bolstering Medicare's solvency.

The Bond/Mikulski amendment would express the sense of the Senate that spending on the Elderly Housing Program (section 202) will be maintained at no less than its present annual level of \$645 million for the next 5 years (President Clinton proposed an 83-percent cut, to \$109 million annually, with the intention of moving program services into the HOME housing program, which emphasizes local decision-making, and into voucher programs, which allow beneficiaries to decide where they will live instead of living in Government-built housing).

Those favoring the amendment contended:

We have offered this amendment to make clear that the Senate is not going to go along with President Clinton's plan to slash funding for the Elderly Housing Program. That program, which has been in existence since 1959, is a huge success and should be continued. Over the years, it has created more than 330,000 housing units for elderly Americans. From 1992 through 1996 alone, it added 47,800 homes for the elderly. As successful as this program has been in providing housing for elderly Americans, much more can still be done. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development, an additional 1.4 million elderly families

YEAS (97)				NAYS (2)		NOT VOTING (1)	
Republican (52 or 96%)		Democrats (45 or 100%)		Republicans (2 or 4%)	Democrats (0 or 0%)	Republicans	Democrats (0)
						(1)	
Abraham Allard Ashcroft Bennett Bennett Bond Brownback Burns Campbell Chafee Cochran Collins Coverdell Craig D'Amato DeWine Domenici Enzi Faircloth Frist Gorton Gramm Gramm Grams Grassley Gregg Hagel Hatch	Hutchinson Hutchison Inhofe Jeffords Kempthorne Kyl Lott Lugar Mack McCain McConnell Murkowski Roberts Roth Santorum Sessions Shelby Smith, Bob Smith, Gordon Snowe Specter Stevens Thomas Thompson Thurmond Warner	Akaka Baucus Biden Bingaman Boxer Breaux Bryan Bumpers Byrd Cleland Conrad Daschle Dodd Dorgan Durbin Feingold Feinstein Ford Glenn Graham Harkin Hollings Inouye	Johnson Kennedy Kerrey Kerry Kohl Landrieu Lautenberg Leahy Levin Lieberman Mikulski Moseley-Braun Moynihan Murray Reed Reid Robb Rockefeller Sarbanes Torricelli Wellstone Wyden	Coats Nickles		EXPLANAT 1—Official H 2—Necessar 3—Illness 4—Other SYMBOLS: AY—Annou AN—Annou PY—Paired PN—Paired	nced Yea nced Nay Yea

VOTE NO. 66 APRIL 2, 1998

have "worst case housing needs" but are not receiving help. The average program participant is a frail woman in her seventies, living alone, with an income of less than \$10,000 per year. The average program participant, in other words, is someone who needs help caring for herself. President Clinton has suggested that in lieu of this program, funding should be increased for the HOME program and for housing vouchers. We disagree. The HOME program has great merit, and provides some housing for the elderly already, but it is not primarily an elderly housing program. The voucher idea is even worse. We are not going to shove frail, often sick, 70, 80, and 90 year old women into the streets with vouchers and tell them to look around for a place to stay. Vouchers are a fine idea for young, healthy people, but they are a terrible idea for frail elderly Americans who need help taking care of themselves. We trust our colleagues agree, and will join us in supporting this amendment.

No arguments were expressed in opposition to the amendment.